DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 210 88 RC 006 264

TITLE	Mobile Units Supplementing Education (M.U.S.E.). Evaluation, ESEA Title III, Fiscal Year 1970.
INSTITUTION	Dodge County Schools, Fremont, Nebr.
SPONS AGENCY	Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers, BESE.
REPORT NO	DPSC-67-3220
PUB DATE	70
GRANT	OEG-70-27-CoS-13-3320R
NOTE	46p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Aurally Handicapped; Budgets; Educational Innovation; *Evaluation; *Mobile Classrooms; Pilot Projects; Public Support; *Rural Areas; Speech Education; *Speech Therapy; *Testing Programs

ABSTRACT

A project in Dodge County, Nebraska, from July 1, 1969, to June 30, 1970, used Mobile Units Supplementing Education (MUSE) under an Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title III grant. The primary objective of the pilot project and the operational grant was to demonstrate and explore the possibilities of bringing special and supplemental units of education to small isolated school districts. The secondary objective was to research the effect of mobile classrooms, good equipment and supplies, and a planned program of publicity upon the speech therapy program as it effected the students, their parents, the classroom teacher, the superintendents, and the speech therapist. An attempt to obtain an objective evaluation was made through the use of a battery of tests given to selected students at the start and close of the speech therapy program. Subjective evaluations were collected by means of questionnaires. The returned questionnaires indicated that the respondents considered the project to be valuable. However, the project has been discontinued owing to high costs to the local school districts. Copies of evaluation forms used and a breakdown of expenses for the project were also included in the report. (PS)

ED 065210

RECEIVED
JUL 17 1972
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

RECE
RC
TITLE III
PA 88

EVALUATION

ESEA TITLE III

FISCAL YEAR 1970

Mobile Units Supplementing Education (M.U.S.E.)

Dodge County Superintendent of Schools

Fremont, Nebraska

Project Number DPSC67-3220

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

RC006264

Part II NARRATIVE INFORMATION

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title III
as amended

Special and Supplemental Units of Education Brought by Mobile Classroom to Sparsely Populated Territories (Project Muse)

Project Number:	67-3220
Grant Number:	70-27-CoS-13-3320R
State:	Nebraska
Grant Period:	July 1, 1969 to June 30, 1970

1. The primary objective of the pilot project and the operational grant has been to demonstrate and explore the possibilities of bringing special and supplemental units of Education to small isolated school districts, which could not provide these services either because of low financial ability or lack of student population, through the use of the motorized mobile classroom. The secondary objective of the operational or continuational grant has been to research the effect of a well planned mobile classroom, good equipment and supplies, and a planned program of publicity upon the speech therapy program as it effects the students, their parents, the classroom teacher, the superintendents and the speech therapist and at the same time to provide therapy to selected schools within the area. It was planned to provide therapy to some schools that had never had this service in the past, some schools that had had speech therapy service, and to certain selected non-public schools. Plans were to drop some of these schools as soon as another source of speech therapy became available.

It was felt that further study was needed in establishing a Speech Stimulation Program of some nature within the

lower grades of our schools. It was felt by the project staff and the therapists available for consultation that the nember of children within our area prevented a good speech stimulation program from being conducted by the speech therapist along with their speech therapy program and the the speech stimulation program could best be conducted by the classroom teacher under the direction of the therapists using pre-recorded speech tapes and lesson plans.

An attempt was made to obtain an objective evaluation of this project through the use of a battery of tests given to selected students of one school at the start and the close of the speech therapy program in order to determine if any change in achievement had taken place. Results of these tests and an evaluation of the results will be reported in the section on evaluation in our final report. The speech therapist has been aided by the Educational Service Unit's Psychologist, the Dodge County Visiting Teacher, and the students' classroom teacher in giving and evaluating these tests and the results.

It was felt by the project staff of the planning and operational grants that the information needed to determine the effectiveness of this project could best be obtained through the use of questionnaires completed by the speech therapist, the students, the students's parents, the classroom teacher, the school superintendents, and other individuals being serviced by the mobile classroom. Because the services of the mobile classroom was mainly in the field of speech and hearing therapy and

some supervision of the speech stimulation programs it was felt that this evaluation, must, by the nature of the services being offered by subjective and that very little objective information could be obtained except for the actual operational expenses of the program as compared to the operational expenses of the Dodge County Speech Therapy Program. The results of these evaluations(questionnaires received as of 4 June 1970) for the school year 1969-70 have been compiled and are being forwarded together with this Narrative Information. The Department Head of the University of Wyoming(Speech and Hearing Therapy) and an Evaluation Team appointed by the Nebraska State Department of Education have evaluated this project during the past year. Copies of their reporst are forwarded herewith.

2) Influence of our Title III project on:

b) Public Support for educational innovations and change

Work done under the planning grant played a large role in creating and maintaining intact our Educational Service Unit. Meetings of both the Educational Service Unit's Board and the administrative personnel of the different schools within our area were held at the Offices of the Pilot Project during the later part of 1966 when the educational service unit was first being organized and was without funds. Preliminary discussions by the administrators and the board members laid the foundations for many of the services now being offered by the personnel of the Educational Service Unit.

Three members of the project staff gave speechs to public organizations on the services that could be given by the educational service units. The effectiveness of their speechs was demonstrated by the fact that the Educational Service Unit carried in all four counties when voted upon by the people for inclusion or exclusion within the service unit.

It is felt that the use of itinerant speech therapists throughout the state of Nebraska can be traced to a great extent to the establishment of a County Speech Therapy Program within Dodge County, State of Nebraska, in 1961. From this program grew the original request that was submitted by the Dodge County Superintendent which was the basis for Project Muse. Much of the State of Nebraska is now being serviced by itinerant therapists through a method very simular to our original program.

d) The program has effectively demonstrated that units of special educational services can be provided to rural isolated areas when the classes can be maintained at a serviceable level. The mobile classroom has proven to be an effective tool for giving educational tests to small groups where more than one grade is contained within a classroom. Necessary individuals can be removed from the environment of the classroom and tested without disturbing the remainder of the group.

e) The motorized mobile classroom was used to conduct a speech stimulation program with four-five-six year old children within Project Headstart during the past two years. The unit proved to be a very effective tool for this purpose. While evaluation of this part of the project had to be subjective it was considered by all to be a great success with the children. During the early part of the summers we had several children refuse to come aboard the unit and/or to speak to any of the instructors. By the end of the programs all of the children were attending and most of them were speaking both aboard the unit and within their classroom. Magic tricks, games, and songs were used to a great extent during this period.

f) Five new programs in the field of speech therapy have been started during the project period within our area. These programs were started as a direct result of testing and reporting done by the project speech therapist, the Dodge County speech therapist, and the Saunders County speech therapist working together to test children in different schools within our area which had not had

speech therapy services in the past. Programs for the TMSs and EMRs are being established throughout our area by the Educational Service Unit.

h) The University of Wyoming and the State Departmentof Education for the State of Wyoming are investigating the posibilities of Motorized Mobile Units for testing and therapy within their state. Educational Service Unit Number Three is investigating the possibility of obtaining a mobile unit for service to the hard of hearing within their area.

3. We know of no school system within or without our state that has adopted the objectives and/or program of our project. Dr. R. Ramon Kohler, University of Wyoming, who evaluated the project for us in February 1970 stated that he and Dr. Sara James, Wyoming State Department of Education were drawing plans for several units of this type to cover the State of Wyoming for the purpose of speech and hearing testing and for later use within a speech therapy program for isolated rural areas. An evaluation by Dr. William Metzger, Educational Service Unit Number Three, Omaha, Nebraska has resulted in requests from the Coordinator of Speech and Hearing Services of that area who stated:

> "We are now attempting to devise some method of providing services to the hard of hearing in our smaller outlying school districts. We are investigating the possibility of obtaining a mobile unit and hence are much in need of help based on your experience in this area. As we see it now this unit will not be used for testing, but rather for ongoing therapy as part of our aural rehabilitation program.
>
> Our pilot area encompasses approximately 247 square miles and contains three K-12 school districts. We are guesstimating approximately twelve youngsters to be served in each of these school districts. General procedures will be the same as in our regular resource rooms for the hearing handicapped."

4) Project information was disseminated through distribution of a folder describing the unit, publication of information in local newspapers, and issuing of a form report describing the program and/or progress of children within the program. Reports of the progress of children within the program were sent to the parents, the childrens' teachers, and the school administrators. The folder describing the unit was prepared by the Nebraska State Department of Education and was also distributed to the parents, the teachers, and the administrators. Two copies of this report(folder) are enclosed.

Information concerning testing carried on within different schools but not receiving therapy from the motorized unit and/or another source were sent to the administrator of the local school, the classroom teacher, and the Educational Service Unit.

5) Dissemination of the results of speech examinations to the local schools and to the Educational Service Unit has resulted in several speech therapy programs being established within our area. Several of the non-public schools that received therapy services under the project but are being eliminated from further services are searching for ways to contine the therapy programs on their own. Project Headstart will continue the speech stimulation program through the use of their classroom teachers.

6) Evaluation copies(three) are submitted herewith.

7) This project will not be carried forward through either the Office of the Dodge County Superintendent of Schools or by the Educational Service Unit. The controlling Boards of both organizations have concluded that the mobile unit is to expensive to operate because of loss of wheels and other unexpected expenses that have occurred during the past year. However the program will be carried on in part through the use of itinerant speech therapists working out of these offices. Some of the equipment and supplies contained aboard the unit will be retained for use by the Dodge County Speech Therapist. We have been informed that the Nebraska State Department of Education has received several requests for the use of the motorized mobile classroom.

SECTION III - End of Project Report and End of Budget Report

EVALUATION REPORT Fiscal Year 1969-70

Content

Objective evaluation report
Administrators' evaluation
Teachers' evaluation
Parents' evaluation
Evaluation by Dr. R. Ramon Kohler, Ph.D., University of Wyoming
Nebraska State Department of Education Evaluation
Breakdown of cost (operational expenses) for past three years

PART III--EVALUATION REPORT

Section A:

It was felt that methods and procedures for evaluation of this project must of necessity be mainly subjective. Evaluations of the primary objectives of this project was by questionnaires as states in the previous grant requests. These questionnaires have been compiled(those received through 4 June 1970) and the results are forwarded herewith. The results of an evaluation by Dr. R. Ramon Kohler, Head of the Department of Speech Pathology, University of Wyoming, and the results of two evaluations by representatives of the Nebraska State Department of Education are also enclosed.

An attempt was made to obtain an objective evaluation of the results of an individual receiving speech therapy upon his progress and/or scores on achievement tests. Results of these tests were inconclusive and it is felt that no true generalizations can be drawn from this part of the program.

From the results of the questionnaires completed by the school administrators, classroom teachers, students, students' parents, and the speech therapist it is felt that conclusions can be drawn that the motorized mobile unit has proven to be one of the best educational tools devised for speech therapy. The speech therapist has been able to service a greater number of students and schools without any reduction is dismissal and/or improvement rate among the students. The unit has improved settings for parent and teacher conferences and has helped to create a greater interest in speech improvement programs among

the classroom teachers.

The unit has proven to be an excellent environment for speech and hearing testing, and for giving achievement and Primary Mental Ability Tests to small groups of children. When plugged into an electrical source there is no distraction due to outside noises and/or visual distractions except for the view through the windshield which could be eliminated by hanging a curtain over it. Lighting is good at each carrel and individual dividers prevents visual distractions.

It is felt that the planning grant for this project and the efforts made by the staff have been largely responsible for all four of our counties voting to join the Educational Service Unit.

The project was able to bring speech and hearing services to many schools that had not had these services in the past. In the three years that the project has been in operation several speech therapy programs have been started within the four county area. Many of these programs were started as a direct result of speech tests that were given aboard the unit. Speech therapy programs and/or speech stimulation programs were also started within many non-public schools and Project Headstart at Midland College.

One hundred and Forty One students have received speech therapy and/or speech stimulation aboard the motorized mobile unit during the past year. Our most effective use of the project as a demonstration was to have individuals who expressed interest

in the project come to Fremont and evaluate the project for us. Dr. R. Ramon Kohler, University of Wyoming who evaluated the project in February, 1970 stated that He and Dr. Sara James, Wyoming State Department of Education were drawing plans for several units of this type to cover the State of Wyoming for the purpose of speech and hearing testing and for later use within a speech therapy program for rural areas. An evaluation by Dr. William Metzger, Educational Service Unit Number Three, Omaha, Nebraska has resulted in requests from the Coordinator of Speech and Hearing Services of that area who stated:

> "We are now attempting to devise some method of providing services to the hard of hearing in our smaller outlying school districts. We are investigating the possibility of obtaining a mobile unit and hence are much in need of help based on your experience in this area. As we see it now this unit will not be used for testing, but rather for ongoing therapy as part of our aural rehabilitation program.
>
> Our pilot area encompasses approximately 247 square miles and contains three K-12 school districts. We are guesstimating approximately twelve youngsters to be served in each of these school districts. General procedures will be the same as in our regular resource rooms for the hearing handicapped."

Progress made by students within the program and the number of students serviced is indicated in enclosures. There is also a breakdown of project expenses and other information concerning the project.

(a) This project in part will be continued by the Dodge County Board of Supervisors. An itinerate speech therapist has been hired for Dodge County for the following school year. However neither the non-public schools within the City of Fremont nor the County of Saunders will receive further services

from the therapist as they are ineligible to join this program. Several non-public schools within Dodge County will receive the services of the County Speech Therapist under the sponsorship of the local public school. Use of the motorized Mobile Unit will not be continued. The Dodge County Board of Supervisors have voted to turn title to the unit and the equipment contained aboard this unit over to the Nebraska State Department of Education.

(b) The major reason the project is not being continued by the Dodge County Schools is that it is felt that it has proven to be too expensive for the local schools to support.

(c) We know of no school systems in our state or outside of our state that have adopted our project or elements of our project. Many schools throughout the United States are now using Mobile Classrooms but most of these are designed by the company that produces and sells this product.

Evaluation

In an effort to obtain an objective evaluation of the effects of speech therapy on achievement and to correlate these changes in achievement (if any) to progress in speech therapy, tests were given to eight students within the speech therapy program. Science Research Associates tests for Primary Mental Ability and achievement were used. Form C of the Achievement test was given on 11-27-70 and Form D of the same test was given on 4-27-70 a lapse period of five months between the tests. During these five months the students received group therapy for a period of twenty-five minutes per session twice a week. The Primary Mental Ability test was given on 1-23-70. Following are results of these tests and a subjective evaluation of progress made within the speech therapy program.

Scores: Grade Equivalent

Subj.	Test Form	Q Score	Verbal Picture Assoc.	Language Preception	Reading: Comprehension	Reading: Vocabulary	Reading: Total Reading	Subjective estimate of Progress within Speech Therapy progress
A	PMA	76						
	C		1-3	1-	1-	1-9	1-3	Poor to fair
	D		2-1	2-1	1-6	1-3	1-9	
B	PMA	95						
	C		1-2	2-2	1-6	2-3	1-9	Good
	D		2-3	2-7	2-3	2-3	2-2	
C	PMA	111						
	C		1-9	1-8	2-2	1-7	1-9	Good to excellent
	D		2-8	2-5	2-9	3-1	2-8	
D	PMA	101						
	C		2-2	1-8	1-	1-1	1-7	Good
	D		2-5	2-2	2-4	2-3	2-4	
E	PMA	108						
	C		1-	1-				Good to excellent
	D		2-2	2-2	1-	1-9	1-9	
F	PMA	100						
	C		Too immature for testing at this time					Good to excellent
	D		1-9	1-8	1-9	1-5	1-9	
G	PMA	103						
	C		Too immature for testing at this time					Good to excellent
	D		1-9	1-8	1-9	1-5	1-9	
H	PMA	115						
	C		Too immature for testing at this time					Excellent
	D		3-4	3-9	4+	3-6	3-8	
I	This boy was a Mongoloid. Tests were not given.							Excellent

Results of these tests seem to indicate that progress in speech therapy does correlate to a limited extent with achievement and to results of the Primary Mental Ability tests. However, a five month period of time is not sufficient to give definite results and it is felt that no conclusions or generalizations can be reached as a result of this part of the project. It is felt that these tests and/or tests of a simular nature should be given to a larger group of students and for over a longer period of time to determine if there is a true correlation between progress in speech therapy, achievement, and Primary Mental Ability.

EVALUATION REPORTS CONTAIN ONLY THOSE REPLIES RECEIVED BY THE DODGE COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT'S OFFICE PRIOR TO 4 June 1970

DODGE COUNTY SCHOOLS
Fremont, Nebraska

Questionnaire for Administrators of schools with children in the speech therapy program conducted under the Supplementary Centers and Service Program of Public Law 89-10.

1. Did your school have the services of a speech therapist prior to the inception of the program within the mobile unit? Yes 3 No 4

a. If the answer to question 1 is yes, in your opinion how does the program conducted within the unit compare with that conducted within the school prior to the time the unit was in operation?

Much improved 2 Improved ___ About the same 1 Worse ___

2. What has been your observation of the childrens' attitude toward attending speech therapy sessions within the mobile unit? On the average

Wanted to attend 6 Didn"t care ___ Did not want to attend ___
No direct contact with the children 1 .

3. Do you feel that the attitude of the parents whose children are attending the speech therapy sessions toward the speech therapy program are: favorable 7 unfavorable ___.

4. Have you noticed any change in the general attitude toward learning among the children who have attended the speech therapy sessions? Yes 4 No 2 . Don't know 1

a. If answer to the above question is yes do you feel that these attitudes, on the average, have: Improved 4 Deteriated ___.

5. What has been your observation of the teachers' attitudes toward taking children from the classroom for speech therapy?

Favorable 7 Unfavorable ___.

6. Do you feel that there is a better method of providing speech therapy services to your school? Yes 1 No 6

7. If answer to No. 6 is yes please indicate what ycu feel would be a better method of providing this service.

Full time service is best for us.

COMMENTS OF ADMINISTRATORS School Year 1969-70

1. Full time service is best for us.

2. Teachers and parents seem satisfied. I have heard favorable comments about the results of the program. Most children have improved; those who have not probably are careless in practicing what they have learned. I appreciate the comprehensive reports Mr. Kierstead makes to teachers and parents on the progress of each child.

3. In our situation we reached only the pupils in the special education room and we did have others in need. I appreciated the attention given to our students and believe that we need speech therapy service.

4. We were certainly very happy to be a part of this program. Mr. Kierstead has done a tremendous job. The youngsters enjoyed going to class and because of Mr. Kierstead's interest and patience, they learned much. It was remarkable to see all the different materials with which he had to work. It is hoped this program can continue again next year so that the children may benefit from it and not lose all that has thus far been taught.

5. Some of the students could have used more individual work and more often. I realize this is difficult.

6. We need a speech program in our own building and our own speech therapist, however, finances and personnel are not available.

7. I believe this has been a very valuable program, which has RRRR rendered us a service which we could not otherwise have provided.

Personally I am very gratiful and do look forward to its continuance. A job well done.

DODGE COUNTY SCHOOLS
Fremont, Nebraska

Questionnaire for teachers with children in the speech therapy program conducted under the Supplementary Centers and Services program of Public Law 89-10.

1. Did your school have the services of a speech therapist prior to the inception of the speech therapy program within the unit? Yes 9 No 18 .

a. If the answer to question 1 is yes, in your opinion has does the speech therapy program within the unit compare with that conducted within the school prior to the time the mobile unit was in operation?

Much improved 4 Improved 2 About the same 3 Worse ____

2. What has been your observation of the childrens' attitude toward attending speech therapy sessions within the unit?

Wanted to attend 25 Didn't care 1 Did not want to attend 1 .

3. Do you feel that the attitude of the parents whose children are attending the speech therapy sessions toward the speech therapy program are:

Favorable 26 Unfavorable 0 Don't care 1

4. Have you noticed any change in the general attitude toward learning among the children who have attended the speech therapy sessions? On the average. Yes 14 No 13 .

a. If answer to the above question is yes do you feel that these attitudes, on the average, have:

Improved 14 Deteriated ____.

5. Do you feel that there is a better method of providing speech therapy services to your school? Yes 1 No. 26

a. if answer to above question is yes please indicate what you feel wound be a better method of providing these services.

1. Resident Speech Therapist

COMMENTS OF TEACHERS School Year 1969-70

1. It would be better to have more therapists to have more individualized children sessions.

Also I feel the teachers could work with the classroom teacher and give group therapy lessons. I know this is available.

Also, Speech from Channel 12 is excellent for lower primary, and would provide group lessons.

2. I like a mobile unit because it provides a well equipped and comfortable place for children to have speech therapy. They also are somewhat isolated which I consider a good thing for those who need special help.

3. I think that the parents and the pupils themselves appreciate highly the opportunity of Speech Therapy for the children who are in need of help in this matter.

4. In my opinion the mobile unit is a very satisfactory method of handling the speech therapy program.

5. I feel the therapy my students received the past year was excellent and very beneficial-especially to D____. Both students always looked forward to attending the lessons and returned enthusiastic and anxious to relate activities the experienced.

I can see a definite improvement in D____'s speech. I's sure that her confidence in her speech is a predominate factor in the improvement in her reading abilities. Unlike at the beginning of this year, she has shown much more interest and enthusiasm in this area, and her ability to read orally and contribute toward class discussions has grown considerably.

I hope that after reexamination next fall if she still needs therapy, that she will improve as much as she has this past year. I've been very satisfied with her progress.

6. I was quite pleased with the speech therapy program.

Many times the children with speech problems are also slow learners. In building up their ability to speak they acquire a self-confidence which shows itself in related school work. Thanks to all responsible for the program.

7. This was a very helpful program and I felt he should have had more children but he didn't have time enough to do all this, because of too many speech defects in upper grades. This program helped in getting them to work on their own and supplemented what I was trying to do also.

8. The children enjoyed the program. I have noticed improvement in their speech.

9. It is a good program and so helpful for St. Pat's. I got some favorable comments from the parents, so I am sure it is much appreciated. The unit came at an ideal time as far as my teaching schedule was concerned.

I think perhaps I should have been more acquainted with the purpose and mechanics of the unit in general.

10. Mr. James Kierstead did a very fine job in presenting the program and therapy. The students did not lose interest or refuse to attend at any time.- They always looked forward to the service twice a week.

COMMENTS OF TEACHERS School Year 1969-70 (Continued)

11. As a teacher I would like to carry on in the classroom what is being worked on in the speech unit. I don't mean the exercises but I feel I could remind the child about pronouncing certain things correctly but I often feel I shouldn't because I would approach it wrong and embarrass him. Maybe a conference between the therapist, the teacher, and the parents would make a stronger continuation of the program and would be of help to all concerned.

12. I think it would be helpful in the teacher could be given a few specific speech exercises for the child at the beginning of the year.

13. My students were most anxious for speech days. They helped each other and provided the extra push in speaking correctly. L_____ came to me as a whisperer so no one would hear him, now he volunteers in class. J_____ is still conscious of his problem but he will try very hard for me. I felt it was a valuabile asset to my fellows this year. Hope they will be able to continue.

14. What I was most impressed by was the attitude that Mr. Kierstead had given the children because no one ever looks down upon them or makes fun of them, and the children attending the speech unit do not feel ashamed and actually share their learning. I'm all for it.

15. The use of the mobile unit makes this program available to many children who would otherwise not get the therapy they need.

Parents, generally I think are glad their children have this opportunity to receive help.

16. This program does help to improve the speech and seems to prevent any inferior feeling or discouragement from the difficulty. The activities are interesting and fun and gives the child his own "thing" to do. Mr. Kierstead takes time for individual evaluations and help. The Muse surely has the mechanical appeal to children.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARENTS OF CHILDREN IN THE SPEECH THERAPY PROGRAM CONDUCTED WITHIN THE MOTORIZED MOBILE UNIT. School Year 1969-70

1. How long has your child been in the speech therapy program?

1 year 11 2 years 9 3 years or longer 5

2. If your child received speech therapy prior to that conducted within the mobile unit please answer the following:

a. In your opinion how does the speech therapy program conducted within the unit compare with that conducted within the school?

Much improved 6 improved 2 about the same _____ worse _____

b. What has been your child's attitude toward attending the program within the unit compared with attending the program within the school building?

Much improved 5 improved 3 about the same _____ worse _____

3. If your child did not receive speech therapy prior to that conducted within the mobile classroom please answer the following:

a. What has been your child's attitude toward attending the speech therapy sessions:

Wanted to attend 15 Didn't want to attend 1 Didn't care 2

b. Do you feel that the speech therapy program should be continued within the mobile classroom?

Yes 25 No 2

4. What is your personal evaluation of your child's speech now as compared with his speech at the start of the school year?

Much improved 6 improved 15 about the same 4 regressed _____

5. What is your personal evaluation of your child's attitude toward the general school situation now as compared to that at the start of the school year?

Much improved 8 improved 11 about the same 5 regressed _____

6. Please feel free to make any comment about the speech therapy program and/or the motorized mobile unit that you think might help us to evaluate its effectiveness. Your thoughts and comments are of the upmost importance to us in attempting to evaluate this program.

School Summer School Program. He made very little progress there because he received little or no individual attention. I feel the individual work helped him the most and I think the fact that he liked "Jim", as he called him-so well helped him to try to do better. I'd like to see the program continued within the mobile unit and appreciate very much all that Mr. Kierstead has done for D_____.

11. We have found that J_____ has been fortunate in being able to be one of the students tought under this program.

We feel that it has definitely developed better character, the ability to express herself and above all the vast improvement of pronouncing words and expression of sounds.

It is our feeling that superb instruction has made this program a success for our child.

J_____ has always looked forward to the time which she was to spend at speech therapy.

12. I think the mobile unit should be kept in operation. This is one way the children get attention most of them need the extra help like this.

13. I think the speech therapy has tought S_____ to be more calm and quiet. And since she started the therapy she has had only one spell of loss of voice to my knowledge.

I think the therapy is helping her even though it is slow progress.

14. I think the program helped my daughter very much and she seems as though she talks more and reads better and has much more speech clearness and cares more about discussing of studies in school.

15. It would certainly be helpful to us as parents of two children that must have speech assistance to have something to use or go by at home. I can feel that they are being helped in their manner of speech, but they still make the same errors over and over again. I feel that after a year of this speech help at least some of these should have been eliminated. We'll try and be more patient with G_____ because he certainly needs a lot of help.

16. I think this program may give R_____ more confidence in himself. Also he does not like to study and I think he may have missed the phonic training they have received in school. He does not apply himself, unless someone stands over him.

17. I feel it is a much needed part of education.

COMMENTS OF PARENTS School Year 1969-70

1. We think the program is very much worthwhile and appreciate the help given our child with his speech problem.

2. I must say that K___'s speech has improved considerably over the past 2 years. I can recognize the words he is being corrected on as he says the words much slower and emphasizes them.

I am very thankful for the speech therapy program thru the school and hope it can be continued in future years.

I will be looking forward to having K_____ back in the speech program next fall and will help him all I can during the summer months. Thanking you so much.

3. We are very pleased with the mobile unit. I know we would not be sending her to speech therapy as we could not afford it. She isn't too bad and her problem would have gone unnoticed as we are not trained in that field. So we would not have noticed here speech problem. I think this extra help will give here confidence and help her later on in her studies as well as her English.

We really do appreciate this added service to our school and I wholeheartly recommand that it continues as long as it is needed. We are all for it. Thank you. Keep up the good work.

4. I realize now that I should have visited the mobile unit sometime. I really am sorry--but too late. But C_____ really has improved this year in this schoolroom and activities. He is a much more relaxed boy and for the first time in his school years, he has finally had a Friend. A true pal and buddy in the other kids in his room.. Some one that he would say, can so and so come to our place tonight, and they played together, had fun, laughed, and really understood each other. I'm wondering what will happen if he has to take some classes with the group. It won't take to long to tell whether he gets frustrated.

I think he definitely should continue in the speech program.

5. I feel that R_____ without the speech therapy would be about like I'm today. I have trouble with different words also. I feel that it is a well deserving thing that is being done.

Also B_____ is much improved in his words. When he gets excited he slips a little and I notice the difference right away.

6. We think that D_____'s speech has improved a great deal in fact so much that some of the other members of the family remarked that how clearly she enunciated and perhaps she could give us speech lessons. We have 11 children and I think all the older ones commented that their own speech could stand better sounding of words. D_____ loved working with Jim. He never ceased to make it interesting a a challange to good speaking. Thank you very much.

7. We are fortunate to have a program like this to correct speech. I hope it continues in our county.

8. She has liked the program very much.

9. We hope the mobile unit continues--for it gives people(like us on a limited budget) a chance to help their child as a regular therapist is so expensive. I think the speech program has been very good.

10. D_____ took 2 summer sessions of speech therapy at the W_____Public

UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING
DEPARTMENT of SPEECH PATHOLOGY and AUDIOLOGY
Box 3311—University Station — Laramie, Wyoming 82070
phone 307 766 6426

March 13, 1970

Mrs. Miriam Matousek
Superintendent
Dodge County Schools
Fremont, Nebraska 68025

Dear Mrs. Matousek:

This letter is to comply with a request for a written evaluation of your E.S.E.A. Title III Project, Dodge County Project MUSE. Thank you for the opportunity to observe this mobile speech and hearing unit. May I commend you for the time and effort expended on your behalf to bring this service to the children of Dodge County. Mr. James Kierstead should also receive praise for his service to the unit.

The following individuals were interviewed in connection with my visit:

Mr. C. Herbert Bones, Director
Educational Service Unit #2
Fremont, Nebraska

Mr. Robert E. Gaston, Superintendent
Hooper-Uehling-Logan School Dist.
Hooper, Nebraska

Clarice Adams, Teacher
Hooper-Uehling-Logan School Dist.
Hooper, Nebraska

Mrs. Bertha Olson
Winslow School
Winslow, Nebraska

Mr. James Kierstead
Speech & Hearing Therapist
Dodge County Project MUSE
Fremont, Nebraska

Many of the comments which would normally be made regarding this project have been stated in previous documents; however, they will be restated again as they apply to the present evaluation.

The function of this observer was to (1) evaluate the motorized mobile unit and its application in rural and isolated areas, (2) evaluate the equipment and supplies on board the unit, (3) evaluate the speech therapists' schedule and caseload, (4) make recommendations regarding the future placement of the unit, and (5) evaluate the unit as to its usability by disciplines other than speech correction. In this report these points will be considered in the same order as enumerated here.

1. EVALUATION OF UNIT AND APPLICATION TO RURAL AREAS

The mobile van appears to be the only way most of the rural areas can receive services for children with speech and hearing problems. Those people interviewed and the present evaluator feel that the mobile unit is accomplishing its intended purpose of providing a valuable service and is encouraging schools to take over the function of providing remediation for speech and hearing problems. Lack of adequate training, lack of time, lack of space, and lack of equipment appear to be the major factors which keep others such as the regular teacher from rendering this service.

It is felt this unit is larger and heavier than necessary for a one-man operation. The unit could be better utilized by two therapists, thus servicing twice the children in the same amount of time. The unit could be made more usable by some minor remodeling such as a partition between the driving area and the work area, removing the third carrol on the right side and providing more table space in the rear of the unit, making it more usable for face-to-face contact required in speech and hearing work.

A problem apparent in servicing rural areas on a regular basis appears to be getting into the outlying schools on soft, unpaved roads during certain times of the year. This problem may be overcome by scheduling those schools on a block plan during the favorable times of the year. If future units were anticipated, a smaller, lighter, one-man unit might be considered.

2. EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES

The equipment and supplies on this unit are ample, well-used, and cared for properly. The foregoing is true especially when one considers the type of cases being seen. Additional equipment would only be difficult to store and keep in repair.

The only reason for considering additional equipment would be if the administrators chose to make tape recorders, etc. available for speech improvement activities to the classroom teachers on a check-out basis. This practice should be discouraged, however.

3. CASELOAD AND SCHEDULE

It is natural for such a project to begin servicing a large area and have a small caseload. As schools and individuals become aware of the service, the caseload grows and the area diminishes. This apparently has been the situation with this project. The project began serving four counties, was cut to two, and may be even smaller in the future.

A caseload of near 90 children is too large. This observer would recommend a caseload of 60 children being seen twice weekly and this number only if driving time is not excessive. Normally expected results will not accrue if the service is spread too thin. A large caseload also prevents the therapist from conferencing with parents and teachers regarding the program and progress of children in therapy.

4. FUTURE PLACEMENT

Since the mobile unit has been in operation it has undoubtedly pointed up a need for speech and hearing service to areas considering the service impossible to attain. There are several ways to think regarding the future placement of this unit. The major consideration, however, is that the unit remain in operation regardless of who administers it; otherwise, the past gains in this area are lost.

The agency who originally procured the van expended considerable time, effort and research to insure the success of the project. The Dodge County Schools being selected to maintain control would be limited to a county boundary and may have difficulty to hire a therapist to operate the unit.

If Educational Service Unit #2 assumed responsibility, they could operate the unit as requested by the schools with those participating paying a share of the cost. The ESU has the advantage that they may be able to regulate the itinerant speech therapists so as to get maximal coverage within the area and eliminate duplication of travel, etc. They would not be limited to county lines.

If the State Department of Education were given the unit, they would have problems deciding how best to utilize the van and where to place it.

5. UTILIZATION BY OTHER DISCIPLINES

This area has received consideration in other reports and this observer's comments are similar. The van has great potential for any service or discipline which would meet individual or small groups of students and could be equipped to meet their own specific needs. It could be useful for almost all areas of special education.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The first and major consideration and recommendation is that the van be utilized. The service should not be discontinued as it is the only means by which the rural children can receive this specialized help.

2. The Dodge County Schools should probably retain the van as long as they can hire a therapist to keep the unit operating. The Educational Service Unit has promised to make use of the unit if it comes to them.

3. Priorities should be established as to the areas, schools, and children served by this unit.

4. The caseload should be lowered by use of various predictive devices on the market such as Van Riper's PISTA.

5. The Block System of scheduling should be utilized wherever factors of time, weather, and road conditions cause special scheduling problems.

6. Children who are scattered and who may be removed from the vans's scheduled stops should be brought to the van by their parents.

7. The mechanical problems which have constantly beset the van and its operation be resolved as rapidly and permanently as possible. A smaller generator unit may be advisable.

8. It would be interesting for an evaluator to interview the parents of children served by the unit so as to determine their feelings regarding the adequacy of the project.

9. Speech improvement activities should receive only a minor amount of time and effort from the therapist. His time will not be best utilized unless he spends time training the classroom teacher in speech improvement.

10. The therapist should remain free to select his own schedule and caseload in so far as possible.

Thank you for the opportunity to visit the Project and if you have any questions or comments regarding this evaluation, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

R. Ramon Kohler, Ph.D.
Department Head

RRK:klp

NEBRASKA
State Department of Education
On-Site Evaluation of Title III, ESEA Project

Applicant Agency: Dodge County Superintendent of Schools

Project Title: MUSE

Evaluator's Name and Title: Brakenhoff and Mitten

Visitation Date: 1-23-70 Signature of Evaluator: Composite

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Part I

Directions: Check the position that best represents the degree to which you believe each statement describes this project at the time of your visit. Clarifying comments must be added. Please do so in the space under the applicable statement, or on a separate page. Comments should include the basis for judgments made.

Rating scale: 0 Unable to determine on the basis of information present.

1 Low; the project can improve.

2 Average; the project is functioning satisfactorily.

3 High; the project has succeeded beyond expectations.

	0	1	2	3
1. The present direction of the project is consistent with the stated objectives. The project does an effective job with the students that can be serviced by the speech therapist.			2	
2. Teachers, administrators, pupils, and parents who are involved with the project are aware of its objectives. As a whole, teachers, administrators and pupils who are involved, seem to be aware of the objectives. Parents, in some cases, may not be fully aware of the objectives.			2	
3. Existing policies and practices in the area of the project are conducive to the accomplishment of the objectives. The project is meeting the objectives very well.			2	

	0	1	2	3
4. The project activities are appropriate for meeting the stated objectives. The director seems to do as much as possible to provide proper services. Fuller discussion of the project activities with the teachers would be advisable.			2	
5. The current objectives of the project are relevant to the needs of the learners. One mobile unit and one therapist seem to be meeting the needs of the children in the area. If more area is to be serviced, it would appear that another speech therapist would definitely be needed.			2	
5. It appears that reasonable progress is being made toward meeting the objectives of the project. Seemingly, teachers are working well with the children on the project, but parents should have more information on the progress of the child.			2	
7. Objective measurements are being applied in the project's evaluation methods to determine whether or not the project is having an effect on children. The tape recorder is used effectively in this regard. Parents speech at home has a definite effect on the speech of the child.			2	
8. Dissemination of information about the project is appropriate and adequate within the area of the project. Both parents and teachers could use more information about the project and its progress.			2	
9. Adequate and appropriate provisions are made for the participation of nonpublic students in the project. Over 50% of the children served are from non-public schools.			2	
10. Adequate safeguards are utilized against possible negative effects of the program on children. The director and teachers seem to be very careful about avoiding any negative effects that having a speech defect			2	

	0	1	2	3
11. The physical resources are appropriate and adequate for the achievement of project objectives. More equipment is needed.			2	
12. The human resources are adequate for the achievement of project objectives. (Consider both the regular staff and outside consultants.) The director is doing a good job with his present resources. There are undoubtably many children with speech difficulties who are not receiving help.			2	
13. The project personnel have qualities essential to the success of the project.			2	
14. The budget is appropriate for the current operation of the project. Should be.				
15. There is evidence of good administrative practice in: Leadership Supervision Fiscal Management Evaluation Dissemination				
16. Provisions are being made for the integration of successful project activities into the regular school programs. Full use of "Mr. Mike," taped records, and "Show and Tell." Oral reading used extensively.			2	

	0	1	2	3
17. The Board of Education and administrative staff are committed to support of successful project activities after federal funding ends. There is definitely a question as to full support.	2			
18. Evaluation practices being followed, and measuring instruments in current use are appropriate for measuring the achievement of the objectives. Achievement tests and tape recordings are used. Equipment on the Mobile Unit are used extensively.			2	
19. Provisions for follow-up activities are appropriate and adequate. According to teachers, there could be more provision for follow-up activities.			2	
20. The project has adequate information on hand to indicate compliance with the "Statement of Assurances." Adequate information on hand.				2

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Number of 0 ratings 2x0 = 0
Number of 1 ratings 0x1 = 0
Number of 2 ratings 28x2 = 56
Number of 3 ratings 6x3 = 18

74 ÷ 36 = 2.05

Part II

Directions: Please respond fully to each item below, using additional sheets of paper as needed. Be as objective as possible, citing specific areas where good and poor practices are taking place.

1. What are the strong points of this project?
   1. Services are brought to students who would otherwise not receive speech therapy.
   2. The mobile unit itself and the equipment aboard are excellent.

2. What are the weaknesses of the project?
   1. Follow-up activities should receive more emphasis.
   2. Parents and teachers need to be informed of the objectives of the project.

3. What suggestions would you give for improvement of the project? These suggestions should be based on "low" or "Can't Tell" ratings given in Part I. Please give recommendations both for immediate implementation, and for long-range planning.

   The mobile unit could be used in some instances as a preventive measure.

4. Would you suggest a restructuring or rewording of the project objectives? If so, what?

   There is a need to carefully determine the needs of the children in the four-county area and in cooperation with local school districts and county superintendents assure that each child will receive speech therapy services in the future.

5. Make any additional comments you feel necessary.

   We recommend that future use of the Mobile Unit be placed under the jurisdiction of Educational Service Unit #2. This agency is in a key position to determine the needs of children with the help of local school districts in the four-county area and then coordinate the efforts in the implementation of a program.

NEBRASKA
State Department of Education
On-Site Evaluation of Title III, ESEA Project

Applicant Agency: Dodge County Superintendent of Schools

Project Title: MUSE

Evaluator's Name and Title: Brakenhoff and Mitten

Visitation Date: 4-3-70 Signature of Evaluator: Composite

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Part I

Directions: Check the position that best represents the degree to which you believe each statement describes this project at the time of your visit. Clarifying comments must be added, Please do so in the space under the applicable statement, or on a separate page. Comments should include the basis for judgments made.

Rating scale: 0 Unable to determine on the basis of information present.

1 Low; the project can improve.

2 Average; the project is functioning satisfactorily.

3 High; the project has succeeded beyond expectation:

	0	1	2	3
1. The present direction of the project is consistent with the stated objectives. The project does an effective job with the students that can be serviced by the speech therapist.			2	
2. Teachers, administrators, pupils, and parents who are involved with the project are aware of its objectives. As a whole, teachers, administrators and pupils who are involved, seem to be aware of the objectives. Parents, in some cases, may not be fully aware of the objectives.			2	
3. Existing policies and practices in the area of the project are conducive to the accomplishment of the objectives. The project is meeting the objectives very well.			2	

	0	1	2	3
4. The project activities are appropriate for meeting the stated objectives. The director seems to do as much as possible to provide proper services. Fuller discussion of the project activities with the teachers would be advisable.			2	
5. The current objectives of the project are relevant to the needs of the learners. One mobile unit and one therapist seem to be meeting the needs of the children in the area. If more area is to be serviced, it would appear that another speech therapist would definitely be needed.			2	
6. It appears that reasonable progress is being made toward meeting the objectives of the project. Seemingly, teachers are working well with the children on the project, but parents should have more information on the progress of the child.			2	
7. Objective measurements are being applied in the project's evaluation methods to determine whether or not the project is having an effect on children. The tape recorder is used effectively in this regard. Parents speech at home has a definite effect on the speech of the child.			2	
8. Dissemination of information about the project is appropriate and adequate within the area of the project. Apparently this weakness has not been corrected since the last evaluation.	2			
9. Adequate and appropriate provisions are made for the participation of nonpublic students in the project. Over 50% of the children served are from non-public schools.				2
10. Adequate safeguards are utilized against possible negative effects of the program on children. The director and teachers seem to be very careful about avoiding any negative effects that having a speech defect may have on the children.				2

	0	1	2	3
11. The physical resources are appropriate and adequate for the achievement of project objectives. More equipment has been purchased.	2			
12. The human resources are adequate for the achievement of project objectives. (Consider both the regular staff and outside consultants.) The director is doing a good job with his present resources. There are undoubtably many children with speech difficulties who are not receiving help.			2	
13. The project personnal have qualities essential to the success of the project.			2	
14. The budget is appropriate for the current operation of the project. Should be.			2	
15. There is evidence of good administrative practice in:				
Leadership			2	
Supervision			2	
Fiscal Management			2	
Evaluation			2	
Dissemination		2		
16. Provisions are being made for the integration of successful project activities into the regular school programs. Full use of "Mr. Mike," taped records, and "Show and Tell." Oral reading used extensively.			2	

	0	1	2	3
17. The Board of Education and administrative staff are committed to support of successful project activities after federal funding ends. There is definitely a question as to full support.	2			
18. Evaluation practices being followed, and measuring instruments in current use are appropriate for measuring the achievement of the objectives. Achievement tests and tape recordings are used. Equipment on the Mobile Unit are used extensively.			2	
19. Provisions for follow-up activities are appropriate and adequate. According to teachers, there could be more provision for follow-up activities.			2	
20. The project has adequate information on hand to indicate compliance with the "Statement of Assurances." Adequate information on hand.				2

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Number of 0 ratings 0 X 0 = 0
Number of 1 ratings 2 X 1 = 2
Number of 2 ratings 38 X 2 = 76
Number of 3 ratings 2 X 3 = 6
48 84

84 ÷ 48 = 1.75

Part II

Directions: Please respond fully to each item below, using additional sheets of paper as needed. Be as objective as possible, citing specific areas where good and poor practices are taking place.

1. What are the strong points of this project?

   (a) Services are brought to students who would otherwise not receive speech therapy.
   (b) The mobile unit itself and the equipment aboard are excellent.

2. What are the weaknesses of the project?
   (a) Follow-up activities should receive more emphasis.
   (b) Parents and teachers need to be informed of the objectives of the project.
   (c) The recommendation made on January 23, 1970, apparently has not been implemented.

3. What suggestions would you give for improvement of the project? These suggestions should be based on "low" or "Can't Tell" ratings given in Part I. Please give recommendations both for immediate implementation, and for long-range planning.

   The mobile unit could be used in some instances as a preventive measure.

4. Would you suggest a restructuring or rewording of the project objectives? If so, what?
   Possibly. We believe that one of the original, stated purposes of the project was the correction of speech problems. It seems apparent that in the four-county area speech therapy has become more of a reality and now there is a need to carefully determine the needs of this area and in cooperation with local school districts and county superintendents assure that each child will receive this service. It would appear then that someone who is familiar with the four-county area should assume this responsibility in the future.

5. Make any additional comments you feel necessary.

Mr. Bones, the administrator of Service Unit Number Two, indicates in the following paragraphs suggestions for the future use of the Mobile Unit, should it be assigned to them.

"This is to give a summary of the criteria to direct the use of the Mobile Unit that was used in Project MUSE, financed under Title III, of P.L. 89-10 by the U.S. Office of Education, and sponsored locally by the Dodge County Superintendent of Schools, Fremont, Nebraska, should this vehicle and equipment be assigned to Educational Service Unit Number Two.

(1) It is expected that the first use of this mobile classroom will be to bring speech therapy services to those schools that have too few pupils to justify hiring a speech clinician, and are unable to obtain such service on a cooperative or non-resident tuition basis.

(2) Of the above schools, priority will be given those who do not have facilities to house a speech therapy program by an itinerant speech clinician, on any part-time or other cooperative basis.

(3) It is expected to cooperate with existing school, and school-cooperative, programs as much as possible, using the motorized classroom to help cover such parts of their area as may be isolated from the regular program facilities to accomodate a regular, itinerant speech clinician.

(4) Every possible means will be explored to provide speech services to the rural Class I School Districts in Educational Service Unit Number Two, who enroll about 3,500 pupils, by organizing them into service point areas where the mobile classroom may be centrally stationed, and to which individual pupils needing therapy may be brought.

(5) It will be considered to extend the use of the vehicle facility to summer programs, and possible Saturday therapy classes.

(6) Since Educational Service Unit Number Two provides speech therapy only as administrator of a school cooperative program the services provided by this mobile unit will be considered part of the cooperative program.

It is expected that, should this mobile unit be assigned to Educational Service Unit Number Two, all operative and financial records kept on the Project MUSE will be made available to the Administrator of Educational Service Unit Number Two so that he mau be able to obtain and excercise the best possible judgments as to the most efficient and acceptable use and operation of this motorized classroom."

The evaluators further recommend that wherever possible two specialists be used on the Mobile Unit, thereby increasing its usability.

It would also be advisable for the Service Unit to appoint a speech coordinator for the four-county areas who would be responsible for coordinating all speech activities in Educational Service Unit Number Two.

Since this project will be terminated July 30, 1970, it seems appropriate to make some recommendations concerning its future use.

Originally the unit was designed for operation in a four-county area of Educational Service Unit Number Two. It has been used on a limited basis in this Educational Service Unit. Primarily its use has been limited to Dodge County. We recommend that its future use be placed under the jurisdiction of the Educational Service Unit Number Two. This agency is in a key position to determine needs with the help of the local school district in the four-county area and then coordinate the efforts in the implementation. We feel that the Mobile Unit stressing not only the program aspect of it, but the physical use as well, would be able to be used most effectively by this agency. It would be able to place a unit in key positions throughout the four-county area, thus assuring that as many students as possible would have the benefit of speech therapy and/or speech stimulation services.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CHILDREN IN SPEECH THERAPY PROGRAM SCHOOL YEAR 1969-70:

		Yes	No
1.	Did You enjoy the speech program?	82	6
2.	Is the mobile classroom better for speech than your own classroom?	52	36
3.	Has your speech improved since school started	76	11
4.	Would you like to continue in speech?	83	5
5.	Was the mobile classroom comfortable?	52	36
6.	Were you willing to leave your classroom to go to speech?	73	15
7.	Do your classmates accept your attendence at speech without teasing you?	86	2
8.	Has anyone expressed a desire to attend the mobile classroom with you?	37	41
9.	Does your parents like to have you go to speech?	74	14
10.	Does your teacher like to have you go to speech?	83	5
11.	Do you enjoy school better this year than you did last year?	48	40
12.	Do you enjoy playing with children this year more than you did last year?	61	27

BREAKDOWN OF COSTS FOR PROJECT MUSE SCHOOL YEAR 1967-68

Item	Amount Obligated	Depre-ciation	Amount charged to this program	Administ.	Instruct.	Value remaining
Salaries, including deductions						
Project Director	$2000.00	------	$2000.00	$2000.00	------	------
Assist. Pro. Dir. and Speech Therapist	8000.00	------	8000.00	667.00	$7333.00	-------
Clerical Assistants	475.60	------	475.60	75.60	------	-------
Supplies and Materials						
Administration	309.69	------	309.69	309.69	------	-------
Instruction	1332.05	25%	333.01	-------	333.01	999.04
Travel	760.73	-------	760.73	760.73	------	------
Mobile Classroom	16495.00	10%	1649.50	-------	1649.50	14845.50
Equipment	1576.71	20%	315.34	--------	315.34	1261.37
Maintenance of Classroom (gas, oil, repairs, etc)	1285.42	-----	1285.42	--------	1285.42	-------
Other Charges(withholding etc.)	418.16	-----	418.16	418.16	------	--------
Totals:	$32653.36		$15547.45	$4631.18	$10916.27	$17105.91

96 Students received therapy on regular basis
Per student cost(including administrative and instructional cost).....$161.95
Per student cost(instructional cost only).....$113.71
Per student cost(regular Dodge County Program 1967-68).....$120.00

Operational Expenses of Mobile Classroom

Storage, oil, minor repairs.....	$418.06
Gasoline.....	$406.72
Insurance.....	$293.80
Other(wheel balance, title, repairs, etc.	$166.84
Total	1285.42

Total miles on mobile classroom.....12,843
Operational cost per mile.....10 cents per mile

BREAKDOWN OF EXPENSES FOR PROJECT MUSE School Year 1968-69 and Summer Program 1968

School Year 1968-69 10 months Item	Total amount (remaining from 1967-68 + amount expended)	Depreciation	Amount charged to this school year	Administration	Instruct.	Value Remaining
Salaries, Profess. Ad.	$ 3,000.00	------	$ 3,000.00	$ 3,000.00	--------	-------
Salaries, Profess. Ins.	7,100.00	------	7,100.00		$ 7,100.00	-------
Salaries, Nonpro.	600.00	------	600.00	600.00	--------	-------
Supplies, Adm.	181.00	------	181.00	181.00	--------	-------
Supplies, Inst.	1,574.00	25%	393.50	--------	393.50	$ 1,280.46
Travel	28.40	------	28.40	28.40	--------	-------
Mobile Classroom	14,845.50	10 %	1,649.50	--------	1,649.50	13,196.00
Equipment	2,329.37	20 %	465.86	--------	465.86	1,963.51
Maintenance of Classroom (gas, oil storage, repairs, etc.)	1,565.00	-------	1,565.00	--------	1,565.00	-------
Other charges	555.00	-------	555.00	555.00	--------	-------
TOTALS	$ 31,778.27		$ 15,538.26	$ 4,364.40	$ 11,173.86	$ 16,439.97

32 students received therapy on regular basis
Per student cost (including administrative and instructional cost) ---------- $168.89
Per student cost (instructional cost only)---------- $121.45

Operational expenses of Mobile Unit for two years.
Total expenses (including gas, oil, storage, insurance, repairs, title, etc.) $3,163.70
(construction of table and bench included in above costs)
Total miles on classroom: 23,123
Operational cost per mile: 13.6¢

SUMMER PROGRAM 1968 2 months						
Salaries Pro. Adm.	$ 500.00	-------	500.00	500.00	--------	--------
Salaries Pro. Inst.	3,200.00	-------	3,200.00	--------	3,200.00	--------
Salaries, Non-Pro.	100.00	-------	100.00	100.00	--------	--------
Other charges	111.00	-------	111.00	111.00	--------	--------
TOTALS	$ 3,911.00		3,911.00	711.00	3,200.00	--------

13 students received speech therapy and/or speech stimulation on a daily basis.
Per student cost (including administrative and instructional cost) ---------- $62.07
Per student cost (instructional cost only)---------- $ 50.79

32

45

BREAKDOWN OF EXPENSES FOR PROJECT MUSE School Year 1969-70 and Summer Program 1969 Estimated as of 1 June 70

10 month

Item	Total amount (remaining from 1968-69 + amount expended)	Depreciation	Amount charged to this school year	Administration	Instructional	Value remaining
Salaries, Profess. Admin.	$2200.00	------	$2200.00	$2200.00	-------	---------
Salaries, Profess. Inst.	$9000.00	------	$9000.00	------	$9000.00	---------
Salaries, Nonprofessional	$400.00	------	400.00	400.00	---------	---------
Supplies, Adm.	196.29	------	196.29	196.29	---------	---------
Supplies, Instructional	1575.00	25%	396.25	-------	396.25	1278.75
Travel	182.00	------	182.00	182.00	---------	---------
Mobile Classroom	13196.00	10%	1649.50	-------	1649.50	11546.50
Equipment	2059.51	20%	412.00	-------	412.00	1648.50
Maintenance of Classroom (gas, oil, storage, repairs)	1795.00	----	1795.00	-------	1795.00	---------
Other charges	600.00	----	600.00	600.00	------	---- -----
Totals:	$30803.00		16750.00	3578.00	13252.00	14442.00

88 students received therapy on regular basis
Per student cost(including administrative and instructional cost)----------190.34
Per student cost(instructional cost only)----------163.09

Operational expenses of Mobile Classroom for three years.
Total expenses(including gas,oil,storage, insurance, repairs, title, etc).....$4958.70

Total miles on classroom: 29,940
Operational cost per mile 14.56c

Summer Program 1969 7 months

Salaries Profess. Admin.	350.00	------	350.00	350.00	-------	---------
Salaries, Profess. Inst.	2600.00	------	------	-------	2600.00	---------
Salaries, Non Professional	80.00	------	80.00	80.00	-------	---------
Other charges	105.00	------	105.00	105.00	-------	---------

59 students received speech therapy and/or speech stimulation on a daily basis.
Per student cost(including administrative and instructional cost)----------$53.13
Per student cost(instructional cost only) 44.06

ALL COSTS ESTIMATED